

Modified Special Relativity on a fluctuating spacetime

R. Aloisio, A. Galante, and A.F. Grillo

INFN - Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso, SS. 17bis, 67010 Assergi (L'Aquila) - Italy

S. Liberati

International School for Advanced Studies and INFN, Via Beirut 2-4, 34014, Trieste - Italy

E. Luzio

Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di L'Aquila, Via Vetoio 67100 Coppito (L'Aquila) - Italy

F. Méndez

Departamento de Fisica, Universidad de Santiago de Chile, Av. Ecuador 3493, Casilla 307 Stgo-2 - Chile

It was recently proposed that deformations of the relativistic symmetry, as those considered in Deformed Special Relativity (DSR), can be seen as the outcome of a measurement theory in the presence of non-negligible (albeit small) quantum gravitational fluctuations [1, 2]. In this paper we explicitly consider the case of a spacetime described by a flat metric endowed with stochastic fluctuations and, for a free particle, we show that DSR-like nonlinear relations between the spaces of the measured and classical momenta, can result from the average of the stochastic fluctuations over a scale set by the de Broglie wavelength of the particle. As illustrative examples we consider explicitly the averaging procedure for some simple stochastic processes and discuss the physical implications of our results.

PACS: 03.30.+p, 04.60.-m

I. INTRODUCTION

The existence of a length (or energy) scale at which the effects of quantum gravity (QG) can not be neglected, and the fact that this scale should be the same for all the inertial observers, have recently led to the proposal of a Deformed (or Doubly) theory of Special Relativity (DSR) [3, 4, 5]. In momentum space a simple way to characterize DSR theories is that they corresponds to deformations of the Poincaré algebra in the boost sector. Indeed such deformed boost algebra amounts to the assertion that physical energy and momentum of DSR can be always expressed as nonlinear functions of a fictitious pseudo-momentum π , whose components transform linearly under the action of the Lorentz group [4, 6]. More precisely one can assume the existence of an invertible map $\mathcal{F}$ between two momentum spaces: the *classical space* $\mathcal{P}$, with coordinates π_μ , where the Lorentz group acts linearly and the *physical space* P , with coordinates p_μ , where the Lorentz group acts as the image of its action on $\mathcal{P}$. Also, $\mathcal{F}$ must be such that $\mathcal{F} : [\pi_0, \vec{\pi}] \rightarrow \kappa$ for all elements on $\mathcal{P}$ with $|\vec{\pi}| = \infty$ and/or $\pi_0 = \infty$ where κ is some quantum gravity scale¹. Most commonly such a scale is taken to be the Planck energy, $\kappa \sim M_P \approx 1.22 \times 10^{19}$ GeV.

While the precise formulation in the momentum space for the one particle case seems very well understood [4, 5, 7], there are still pressing open problems that makes unclear the precise role of DSR in QG [8]. In particular

it is so far unknown the realization of DSR in coordinate space, (although great efforts has been devoted to find a theory mirroring what happen in the momentum space [4, 9]) and even the theory in momentum space faces severe challenges as the problem of saturation (the fact that DSR apparently does not allow for objects with energies greater than the invariant scale, the Planck momentum) and the multiplicity problem (the fact that in principle there is an infinite number of deformations of relativistic symmetry).

These problems appear to be related to the interpretation of the non-linear relation between the classical and physical momenta² and have recently motivated the development of approaches to DSR within which the latter is seen no more as a new fundamental extension of special relativity but instead as an effective modification of it due to the non complete negligibility of quantum gravitational effects as the energy scales involved approach the quantum gravity one. For example one of the most pursued interpretations of DSR actually resort to a more fundamental five-dimensional momentum space in order to make sense of the four dimensional non-linear dispersion relations that characterize DSR [10].

Along this line of thought, it was recently proposed [1] that DSR could be interpreted as an effective theory of measurement for high energy particle properties. According to this framework, the relation between “true” energy and momentum of a particle (the *classical* variables

¹ Note that this requirement imposed on the theory is equivalent to say that such a scale should be the same for all the inertial observers.

² An interpretation that indeed should actually justify why the physically relevant variables p are indeed the DSR ones, and not the much more familiar, *classical* momenta π .

π of DSR) and observed quantities (the *physical* variables p of DSR) acquires, at sufficiently high energies, Planck suppressed distortions induced by quantum gravity (QG) effects. These relations can be identified with DSR-type deformations. In [2] we argued that this non linear nature arises as a result of the unavoidable averaging over QG fluctuations of the metric around flat spacetime which is required in order to properly define energy and momentum in first place. In this note we go a step further and propose an explicit toy model of how this class of non linear functions might appear.

Our model is based on three points

- we take into account quantum gravity fluctuations at the Planck scale by adding a stochastic term to the classical 1-form tetrad field (associated to the spacetime metric in the system of reference in which the measurement is performed [1, 2]).
- we define an average over the spacetime fluctuations performed by the particle as it propagates as the result of its (quantum mechanical) finite size,
- we make an assumption about the specific form of the correlation of these stochastic process.

The first point is, we believe, a quite reasonable one, and it is introduced in order to model the spacetime fluctuations at the Planck scale. Although some arbitrariness is present in the assumption of the kind of modification of the tetrad, our result will be quite generic and one might hope that the precise form of such a modification will be in the end fixed by some quantum gravity theory. The second assumption is at the heart of our model and it asserts that what the particle really does as it propagates is to average over the fluctuations, defined with respect to the system of reference in which the particle is observed, and such averaging is just determined by the particle characteristic “resolution” scale which we assume to be related to its de Broglie wavelength. The third point is, at least partly, a consequence of the first one, as we will see, but clearly is also due to our ignorance on the details of quantum gravity. In other words, we have to choose some specific stochastic process.

This toy model is clearly a poor substitute for a full QG theory, but it will allow us to elaborate on the possible outcomes of the procedure and have an explicit example of how things might work. In the next section we will introduce the fluctuations in a very general ground. In section III we will provide examples of fluctuations and its relations with DSR. The final section is devoted to discussion, some speculative issues and conclusions.

II. FLUCTUATIONS AND DSR

Our underlying assumption is that the spacetime, when probed at scales of the order of the Planck one, reveals its quantum nature which can be modeled by a classical metric with an extra fluctuating part [11].

Let us consider four dimensional spacetimes with topology $\mathbb{R} \otimes \mathcal{M}_3$, where $\mathcal{M}_3$ are space-like three manifolds parametrized by a real number t , which we will call time. The usual ADM decomposition [12] of the four dimensional metric $G_{\mu\nu}$ (with $\{\mu, \nu\} \in \{0, 1, \dots, 3\}$) reads

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} -N^2 + N^l N_l & N_m \\ N_n & g_{mn} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where g_{mn} is the metric of $\mathcal{M}_3$ and $N^l N_l = N_l N_m g^{lm}$ (with g^{mn} being the inverse of g and the latin indexes $\{m, n, \dots\} \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ being indexes of coordinates adapted to M_3). The lapse (N) and shift (N_m) functions characterize the embedding of M_3 in the four dimensional spacetime.

In the Hamiltonian formulation of gravity, the metric g , as well as its conjugate momenta, are determined by the equations of motion, while the lapse and shifts remain arbitrary (Lagrange multipliers). An alternative formulation of gravity — which is the starting point for Loop Quantum Gravity — can be given in terms of the one-forms $e^A = e^A_\mu dx^\mu$, where the indexes $\{A, B, \dots\} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ are local Lorentz indexes, that is, the tetrads are defined up a local Lorentz transformation Λ^A_B : $e'^A = \Lambda^A_B e^B$ and characterize a given system of reference.

The matrix element e^A_μ , for the previously mentioned ADM decomposition (1) is

$$e^A_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} e^0_0 & 0 \\ e^L_0 & e^L_m \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where $\{I, J, \dots\} \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and the following relations hold: $e^0_0 = N$, $N_m = e^I_m e^J_0 \eta_{IJ}$, $g_{mn} = e^I_m e^J_n \eta_{IJ}$. Here $\eta_{IJ} = \text{diag}(1, 1, 1)$. Note also that the requirement $e^0_i = 0$ is equivalent to say that the “time” coordinate in spacetime coincides with the time coordinate in the tangent manifold. Finally e^μ_A are the matrix elements of the inverse of (2), that is, the solution of $e^A_\mu e^\mu_B = \delta^A_B$. Within the framework proposed in [1, 2] the observed momenta will then be identified as $p_A = \pi_\mu \langle e^\mu_A \rangle$ where the $\langle \dots \rangle$ implies the averaging over the QG fluctuations.

In the example we study here, we will assume that spacetime has an underlying structure due to quantum effects. A “free” particle that moves in such a spacetime probes this structure (*e.g.* moves along slightly deformed geodesics) with a resolution that can be assumed to be related (and approximately equal) to the de Broglie wave length of the particle, since this is the best accuracy with which the latter can be localized³. In this sense the

³ It is possible, however, to conceive different choices of the resolution with which the particle “probes” spacetime which are corresponding to decreased accuracy. For example one can imagine that the spacetime structure is probed by the particle via gravitational interaction, in this case the natural scale come up to be

particle in its motion averages the fluctuations over this length scale. In agreement with the approach of [1, 2] the outcome of such averaging has to be calculated from the form of such fluctuations in the reference frame in which the particle energy and momentum are measured ⁴.

In modeling the above framework we shall have to make assumptions about the form of the quantum fluctuations. In this sense we shall here assume that the metric can be described as the sum of a classical term plus a stochastic one whose role is to model our ignorance of the details of the underlying quantum gravity theory. Within our ADM approach the above ansatz implies that the tetrad field will be determined up to a function which is a stochastic function of time: $\xi(t)$ (indexes are not important at this point). Since it is a stochastic function there is a probability distribution $P[\xi]$ associated to each one of these processes.

Form the operational point of view, this stochastic term can be understood as follow. Let assume that an observer is able to determine the tetrad at some instant t_1 . If the same experiment is performed at $t_2 > t_1$, then there are no ways to predict the value of $\xi(t_2)$ from our knowledge of $\xi(t_1)$. The only information available are the correlation of such values. Moreover if we could have a large number of copies of the same experiment (*i.e.* an ensemble), then all the so obtained tetrads would differ by a term which distributes according to $P[\xi]$.

Since we are interested in deformations of special relativity we restrict to the case of flat classical space-like hypersurfaces, *i.e.* in the absence of the above mentioned stochastic processes we recover classical flat spacetime. In this sense it is then reasonable to cast the matrix elements $e^A{}_\mu$ in the form

$$e^A{}_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \xi^0{}_0(t) & 0 \\ \xi^L{}_0(t) & \delta^L{}_m + \xi^L{}_m(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where $\xi^A{}_\mu(t)$ are time dependent stochastic processes. In what follows we will *assume* that such stochastic processes have a Gaussian joint probability distribution $P[\xi^A{}_\mu, t]$ with zero mean value. Of course there is a priori no physical reason, apart from simplicity and computability, for the choice of Gaussian fluctuations.

In order to preserve rotation invariance, we choose $\xi^L{}_m = \delta^L{}_m \eta(t)$, with $\eta(t)$ is some stochastic function. Then the matrix elements of the tetrad with stochastic components reads

$$e^A{}_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \xi(t) & 0 \\ \xi^L{}_0(t) & \mathbf{1}[1 + \eta(t)] \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{1} = \text{diag}(1, 1, 1)$ and $\xi(t) \equiv \xi^0{}_0(t)$. Eq. (4) can now be interpreted as the standard tetrad for flat spacetime plus time dependent corrections.

We now need to introduce in our model the finite resolution scale of the elementary particle probing the spacetime. The natural way to incorporate this information is to sum up all possible values of the tetrad within this resolution scale. Generically, if $y(t)$ is some quantity such that we do not have information below certain scale Δ , then we define its *mean value* as its average on this resolution scale

$$y(\Delta) = \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \Delta} y(t) dt. \quad (5)$$

We define, therefore, the *mean* tetrad $\epsilon^A{}_\mu(\Delta)$ as the time average of the matrix elements of the tetrad (4) in a given resolution interval Δ

$$\epsilon^A{}_\mu(\Delta) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \xi(\Delta) & 0 \\ \xi^L{}_0(\Delta) & \mathbf{1}[1 + \eta(\Delta)] \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where all quantities $\xi(\Delta)$, $\xi^L{}_0(\Delta)$ and $\eta(\Delta)$ are defined by (5).

The tetrad, therefore, has been averaged in order to take into account the finite resolution, but not over the values that the random variables can take — actually $(-\infty, \infty)$ for every fixed value of t — hence the inverse tetrad in principle could not be defined. For instance, the probability for η to be on an interval containing the value -1 is not zero — although it can be made as small as desired *e.g.* in the Gaussian approximation above — and therefore, the probability for the spatial part of the tetrad of being zero is finite which implies that the inverse of the tetrad is ill defined.

In order to circumvent this problem, we define an “effective tetrad” as a tetrad that is compatible with the metric obtained after the ensemble average is performed. In fact, since in general $\langle f(x)g(y) \rangle \neq \langle f(x) \rangle \langle g(y) \rangle$ for a given probability distribution $P[x, y]$, it is clear that the effective tetrad will not be the same as the tetrad obtained just taking the ensemble average on (6).

The origin of this problem, from a strictly statistical point of view, resides on the fact that we have chosen fluctuations that can have any value, even large, although with a small probability. This can be formally thought to mimic the contribution of topology changing metrics to the Path Integral of QG. The choice of using an effective tetrad corresponds in a sense to keeping, of these contributions, only the (relatively) large distance effects.

Therefore, consider the metric $\langle G_{\mu\nu}(\Delta) \rangle$ obtained from the ensemble average (denoted here by $\langle \cdot \rangle$) of the quadratic form constructed with the mean tetrad (6). The effective tetrad matrix element $\bar{e}^A{}_\mu$ is defined through the relation

$$\begin{aligned} \langle G_{\mu\nu}(\Delta) \rangle &= \langle \epsilon^A{}_\mu(\Delta) \epsilon^B{}_\nu(\Delta) \rangle \eta_{AB}, \\ &\equiv \bar{e}^A{}_\mu \bar{e}^B{}_\nu \eta_{AB}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

the curvature radius associated with the particle $M_P/\mathcal{E}^2$ which corresponds to a loss of accuracy of order $M_P/\mathcal{E}$ with respect to the de Broglie wavelength. This seems to be the preferred case in some alternative derivations of the modified dispersion relations of DSR [13].

⁴ A frame dependence would seem to appear in this statement. This will be further discussed later.

In order to evaluate this quantities explicitly, let us assume that the stochastic variables $\xi^L_0(t)$, $\eta(t)$ and $\xi(t)$ are not correlated. That means that mixed terms like $\langle \eta(\Delta) \xi(\Delta) \rangle$ or $\langle \xi(\Delta) \xi^L_0(\Delta) \rangle$ can not appear in the final expression; also, since we have chosen all processes of Gaussian type with mean value zero, linear terms can not appear neither. A direct calculation shows that the effective metric turn out to be

$$\begin{aligned} \langle G_{\mu\nu}(\Delta) \rangle &= \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \langle \vec{\xi}(\Delta) \cdot \vec{\xi}(\Delta) - [1 + \xi(\Delta)]^2 \rangle & 0 \\ 0 & \langle [1 + \eta(\Delta)]^2 \rangle \delta_{ij} \end{pmatrix}, \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -1 + \langle \vec{\xi}(\Delta) \cdot \vec{\xi}(\Delta) - \xi^2(\Delta) \rangle & 0 \\ 0 & [1 + \langle \eta^2(\Delta) \rangle] \delta_{ij} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with $\vec{\xi} \cdot \vec{\xi} = \xi^L_0 \xi^M_0 \eta_{LM}$.

It is clear that modifications to the metric come from the correlations of the stochastic functions which have the general shape

$$\langle \alpha(\Delta) \beta(\Delta) \rangle = \frac{1}{\Delta^2} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\Delta} \langle \alpha(s) \beta(s') \rangle ds ds', \quad (9)$$

for α, β two generic stochastic process. To avoid a dependence on t_0 we demand translational invariance on the correlators.

Notice, moreover, that the effective metric, after averages, depends on the resolution scale of the particle, much like the *rainbow gravity models* [15]. This dependence appears only through the correlation functions of the stochastic processes.

From the effective metric it is possible to read the effective tetrad and also its inverse. It is not hard to see that they are given by

$$\bar{e}^A{}_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{1 + \langle \xi^2 - \vec{\xi} \cdot \vec{\xi} \rangle_c} & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{ij} \sqrt{1 + \langle \eta^2 \rangle_c} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

$$\bar{e}^\mu{}_A = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \langle \xi^2 - \vec{\xi} \cdot \vec{\xi} \rangle_c}} & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{ij} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \langle \eta^2 \rangle_c}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where we have defined for every stochastic process the correlator as (9)

$$\langle \xi^2 \rangle_c \equiv \frac{1}{\Delta^2} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\Delta} \langle \xi(s) \xi(s') \rangle ds ds'.$$

To make contact with DSR interpretation of [1], consider the measured momentum of the particle P_A . In our model, it is given by the average on the previously defined stochastic processes, that is by $\pi_\mu \bar{e}^\mu{}_A$. Therefore,

the measured energy E and momentum $\mathbf{p}$ for a particle are given by

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\sqrt{1 + \langle \xi^2 - \vec{\xi} \cdot \vec{\xi} \rangle_c}}, \\ &\sim \mathcal{E} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \langle \xi^2 - \vec{\xi} \cdot \vec{\xi} \rangle_c + \dots \right), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p} &= \frac{\boldsymbol{\pi}}{\sqrt{1 + \langle \eta^2 \rangle_c}}, \\ &\sim \boldsymbol{\pi} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \langle \eta^2 \rangle_c + \dots \right). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The first line of both equations is, within our assumptions, in principle valid to all orders in the correlators. In passing from the first to the second line of both equations we have restricted the corrective terms to satisfy $\langle \eta^2 \rangle_c \ll 1$, $\langle \xi^2 - \vec{\xi} \cdot \vec{\xi} \rangle_c \ll 1$, and it is useful to remind here that the stochastic variables η and ξ contain the resolution scale. Lacking a quantum mechanics of particles in a QG background, it is possible that the identification of the resolution scale with the wavelength of the particle, namely its inverse energy, can only be made at first order⁵.

Now let us compare with DSR cases. DSR1 is characterized by the nonlinear relation (at first order in the invariant energy-momentum scale κ)

$$E = \mathcal{E} \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{E}}{2\kappa} \right), \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbf{p} = \boldsymbol{\pi} \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\kappa} \right), \quad (15)$$

where we have discarded the contribution proportional to m/κ in the first equation.

DSR 2, instead, is characterized by the nonlinear relations (also at first order in κ)

$$E = \mathcal{E} \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\kappa} \right), \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{p} = \boldsymbol{\pi} \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\kappa} \right). \quad (17)$$

Comparing expressions (12) and (13) with the corresponding ones coming from DSRs, we see that appropriate assumptions about the shape of the correlators, together with the identification of the resolution scale with the inverse classical energy or momentum (or more in general with a function of them and the Planck scale), allows to obtain them from this stochastic model.

⁵ It is however tempting to take Eq. (12), (13) literally to all orders, $\Delta \propto 1/\mathcal{E}$ strictly and ask what are the conditions to obtain the known DSR theories. For instance DSR2 would require the correlators to be equal and diverging as $\mathcal{E}^2/\kappa^2$ as $\mathcal{E}$ goes to infinity.

Now that we have established the connection between our stochastic model and DSR1 and DSR2, we can turn to the problem of which kind of fluctuations gives rise to specific DSRs. In particular, we need to know how the invariant scale emerges. We shall now deal with these issues by discussing explicitly some examples.

III. EXAMPLES OF STOCHASTIC PROCESS

Since we have introduced stochastic processes at the level of tetrads, modifications to the metric come only from auto correlation functions which are also responsible of the specific non linear functions appearing in (12) and (13). In other words, to make contact with DSR we only need to specify the value of the correlation, which, generically, is not enough to completely determine the stochastic process.

A. Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process

As a starting point, let us consider the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process, $\sigma(t)$. This is the only Gaussian, stationary and Markovian process and has a correlation function of the form [14]

$$\langle \sigma(s)\sigma(s') \rangle = \frac{D}{2k} e^{-k|s-s'|}, \quad (18)$$

where D and k are dimensional constant. It is clear that k^{-1} has dimensions of time, *i.e.* the correlation time while D has dimensions of inverse time and is the diffusion coefficient (the stochastic process $\sigma(t)$ is dimensionless). Given that such stochastic process is introduced as a model of quantum gravity fluctuations at the Planck scale we expect that for both D and k the “natural” value is of the order of the quantum gravity scale κ .

With this correlator and the relation (9), it is not hard to see that

$$\langle \sigma^2 \rangle_c = \frac{D}{k} (e^{-k\Delta} - 1) \frac{1}{k^2 \Delta^2} + \frac{D}{k} \frac{1}{k\Delta}. \quad (19)$$

In our model, we have five stochastic processes, namely ξ, η, ξ^{L_0} , each one characterized by two parameters — $D_\xi, k_\xi, D_\eta, k_\eta, D_{\xi^{L_0}}, k_{\xi^{L_0}}$ — and only one scale of resolution Δ . Fixing these scales, we can make contact with different DSR proposals. In this example we will consider, however, that the correlation time is equal for all processes $k_\xi = k_\eta = k_{\xi^{L_0}} \equiv k$.

Since the resolution scale is the one at which spacetime is probed — equivalently, it is the scale at which the particle averages the gravitational fluctuations — this scale must be greater than the correlation time in order to give sense to a time average as (6). We then assume $\Delta \gg k^{-1}$ and therefore neglect the contribution coming from the exponential in (19). In this limit we have

$$\langle \sigma^2 \rangle_c \sim \frac{D}{k} \left(\frac{1}{k\Delta} + \frac{1}{k^2 \Delta^2} \right) \quad \text{for } k\Delta \gg 1. \quad (20)$$

Then, the non linear relations (12) and (13) turn out to be

$$E \sim \mathcal{E} \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2k^2} \frac{1}{\Delta} + \dots \right), \quad (21)$$

$$\mathbf{p} \sim \boldsymbol{\pi} \left(1 - \frac{D_\eta}{2k^2} \frac{1}{\Delta} + \dots \right), \quad (22)$$

where $\mathcal{D} = D_\xi - \sum_L D_{\xi^{L_0}}$ and $\sum_L D_{\xi^{L_0}}$ is the sum of the diffusion coefficient corresponding to ξ^{L_0} .

From these expressions we see that, for DSR1, the choice $\mathcal{D}/k^2 = 1/\kappa$ and $D_\eta = 2\mathcal{D}$, is mandatory, while $\mathcal{D}/k^2 = 1/\kappa$ and $D_\eta = \mathcal{D}$ reproduce DSR2 expressions. Note that the above requirements are fully consistent with our expectation that both D and k are constants of order κ . In both cases we are assuming that the scale of resolution Δ is of the order of the inverse of the true energy of the particle, that is $\Delta^{-1} \sim \mathcal{E}$. As commented above this choice of the scale of resolution appears to introduce a frame dependence. Clearly only a full treatment of QG can tell whether this is the case or not. What can be said here is that, if the correlators above are the same in all reference frames, no frame dependence will be introduced. Notice also that this is fully consistent with the identifications above with the invariant scale.

As we said, in order to give sense to the average, we have to consider that the time during which the particle probes the spacetime is large compared with the correlation time. Still, it is interesting to consider the limit case when Δ is of the order of k^{-1} . The effective correlator is of order $\mathcal{D}/k$ when $k\Delta$ tends to 1. This means that the corrective term to the effective tetrad (metric) is of the same order of the flat one. Therefore the QG effects mimicked by the stochastic terms we introduced make spacetime totally undetermined. In this sense k^{-1} assumes the meaning of a minimal length.

B. White noise

Another interesting (albeit unphysical) example of fluctuation is the *white noise*. This can be obtained from the previous case by asking that in the limit $k \rightarrow 0$ $\mathcal{D}/k^2 = \gamma$, with γ a finite constant with dimensions of a time. In this case the correlators turn out to be Dirac delta functions

$$\langle \sigma(s)\sigma(s') \rangle = \gamma \delta(s - s'). \quad (23)$$

All integrals are trivial and it is straightforward to check that the non linear functions for measured energy and momentum are given by

$$E = \mathcal{E} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\Delta} (\gamma_\xi - \gamma_s) \dots \right), \quad (24)$$

$$P = \boldsymbol{\pi} \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_\eta}{2\Delta} \dots \right), \quad (25)$$

with $\gamma_s = \sum_L \gamma_{\xi^{L_0}}$. Again, a formal identification $\gamma_\xi - \gamma_s = \kappa^{-1}$ and $2(\gamma_\xi - \gamma_s) = \gamma_\eta$ gives DSR1 and $\gamma_\xi - \gamma_s = 2\kappa^{-1}$ with $(\gamma_\xi - \gamma_s) = \gamma_\eta$ correspond to DSR2 case.

All our previous arguments are applicable here, and the identification of γ as the invariant scale has the same physical origin as in the previous case.

In synthesis, the examples considered here give rise, at first order, to DSR type non linear relations between the measured energy momentum and the classical energy momentum of the particle.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this note we discussed a specific, although schematic, realization of the ideas expressed in [1, 2], namely that the emergence of modifications to Special Relativity is related to the measurement and in particular to the average that any particles operates on the Quantum Gravitational fluctuations of spacetime.

In our model, a stochastic term is added to the tetrad of a flat space time and two averages are defined. One is the usual statistical average, defined through the distribution function of the stochastic processes. The other takes into account the finite resolution that a particle propagating on this spacetime can probe.

These modifications give rise to an effective metric, once all averages are performed, with terms that depend on the resolution scale of the particle, much like the *rainbow gravity models* [15]. This dependence appears only through the correlation functions of the stochastic processes, since we assumed that the dynamical variables are the tetrads rather than the metric. A first comment is interesting here, namely that the particle propagates on a flat background *only* if the correlators, which contain the resolution scale, identically vanish. This gives a condition on our (simplified) model for the *exact* validity of Special Relativity.

The effective metrics allows to define the corresponding tetrad and then, non linear relations between measured momenta and classical variables easily follow. Up to this point our approach has been completely general, mod-⁶ However once this assumption is made, it is no longer possible to distinguish DSR from LIV.

ulo the simplifying assumption of Gaussian behaviour of the stochastic process. In particular, the condition for a frame independent situation *à la* DSR, contrasted with straight violation of LI, corresponds to the frame independence of the correlators. It is at the level of the correlators that a new scale, which we assume to be connected to the Planck one, emerges.

In order to make contact with DSR (or LIV) we need to specify the resolution scale Δ . In standard Quantum Mechanics (QM) it would be proportional to $1/\mathcal{E}$. But it is conceivable that QM will be modified well before reaching the QG scale, where the geometry itself may loose meaning. So, once $\Delta \sim 1/\mathcal{E}$ is assumed, we trust the validity of our relations only to first order in the fluctuation parameters ⁶, and given a particular set of stochastic processes, we find that it is possible to mimic DSR-type relations (or better their first order limit).

After the parameters of the correlators are fixed in order to obtain the desired DSR-like behaviour, the form of the effective metric is fixed. For instance, it is immediate to check that in the DSR2 it is diagonal, giving as expected a light-like behaviour for massless particles. The previous results depend on the identification of the (would be) invariant scale with a specific combination of the diffusion coefficient and the correlation time.

We have presented here a concrete example of how the average on fluctuations of spacetime could give rise to DSR-like dispersion relations, although we cannot state what is the “right” DSR (if there is one) from the cases studied here. Our examples should be taken as an argument in favor of the idea that DSR might appear as an effective feature of quantum gravity effects.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by grant 1060079 from Fondecyt (Chile) (F.M.).

-
- [1] S. Liberati, S. Sonego and M. Visser, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 045001 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0410113].
 - [2] R. Aloisio, A. Galante, A. Grillo, S. Liberati, E. Luzio and F. Mendez, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 045020 (2006). [arXiv:gr-qc/0511031].
 - [3] G. Amelino-Camelia, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **11**, 35 (2002) [arXiv:gr-qc/0012051]; Phys. Lett. B **510**, 255 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0012238]; “New Developments in Fundamental Interactions Theories”, “Karpacz 2001, New developments in fundamental interaction theories”, 137 (2001). [arXiv:gr-qc/0106004].
 - [4] J. Magueijo and L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 190403 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0112090]; Phys. Rev. D **67**, 044017 (2003) [arXiv:gr-qc/0207085].
 - [5] D. V. Ahluwalia-Khalilova, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **13**, 335 (2004) [arXiv:gr-qc/0402023].
 - [6] S. Judd and M. Visser, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 045001 (2003) [arXiv:gr-qc/0205067].
 - [7] G. Amelino-Camelia, Nature **418**, 34 (2002) [arXiv:gr-qc/0207049].
 - [8] L. Freidel, J. Kowalski-Glikman and L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 044001 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0307085]; J. Kowalski-Glikman, *3rd International Sakharov Conference on Physics*, Moscow, Russia, 24-29 Jun 2002. [arXiv:hep-th/0209264].
 - [9] A. A. Deriglazov, Phys. Lett. B **603**, 124 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0409232]; S. Mignemi, [arXiv:gr-qc/0403038]; S. Gao and X. n. Wu, [arXiv:gr-qc/0311009]; D. Kimberly, J. Magueijo and J. Medeiros, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 084007 (2004)

- [arXiv:gr-qc/0303067]. R. Aloisio, A. Galante, A. F. Grillo, E. Luzio and F. Mendez, Phys. Lett. B **610**, 101 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0501079].
- [10] F. Girelli, T. Konopka, J. Kowalski-Glikman and E. R. Livine, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 045009 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0512107]; F. Girelli and E. R. Livine, Class. Quant. Grav. **22**, 3295 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0501075]; F. Girelli, E. R. Livine and D. Oriti, Nucl. Phys. B **708**, 411 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0406100].
- [11] Fluctuating spacetime approaches are discussed, for instance in: Percival, I. C., Physics World **10**, 43 (1997); Percival, I.C. and Strunz, W. T., Proc. Roy. Soc. A **452**, 425 (1999); Camacho, A. Class. Quant. Grav. **22**, 2101 (2005)
- [12] See for example R. Misner, K. Thorn and A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, W. H. Freeman, 1973.
- [13] F. Girelli, S. Liberati, R. Percacci, C. Rahmede, In Preparation
- [14] *The Langevin Equation: With Applications to Stochastic Problems in Physics, Chemistry and Electrical Engineering* by William T. Coffey, Yu. P. Kalmykov and J. T. Waldron, World Scientific Series in Contemporary Chemical Physics Vol. 14, 2004. *Path Integral Quantization and Stochastic Quantization* by Michio Masujima, Springer Tracts in Modern Physics, 2000. *Stochastic Quantization* by Mikio Namiki, Lecture Notes in Physics New Series M, 1997.
- [15] J. Magueijo and L. Smolin, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, 1725 (2004) [arXiv:gr-qc/0305055]; J. Hackett, Class. Quant. Grav. **23**, 3833 (2006) [arXiv:gr-qc/0509103].